

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of January 24, 2008, claims 1, 4-9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,924,824 B2 (hereinafter “Adachi et al.”). In addition, claims 2, 10, 12-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Adachi et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. US 2002/0105510 A1 (hereinafter “Tsuchiya”) or in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,534 (hereinafter “Okumura et al.”).

With respect to the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-20, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 10 and 18 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Adachi et al. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least in Fig. 9. Applicant has also canceled claims 4, 12, 19 and 20. As amended, Application respectfully asserts that the independent claims 1, 10 and 18 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Adachi et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims 1, 2, 5-10 and 13-18 be allowed.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claim 1

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*varying the selection of subfield from line to line in each scanning cycle such that the subfields are selected in a consecutive order from line to line as the lines are scanned consecutively, the subfields of two consecutive lines do not overlap with respect to time during each scanning cycle, no two consecutive line scans use the same subfield and no line is scanned using the same subfield twice during the set of scanning cycles, such that image flicker caused by the subfields is reduced,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Adachi et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Adachi et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

As amended, the independent claim 1 includes the limitation of “*varying the selection of subfield from line to line in each scanning cycle such that...the subfields of two consecutive lines do not overlap with respect to time during each scanning cycle.*” In Fig. 5 of Adachi et al., a diagram of a driving sequence showing an alternative example of a scan line selection sequence of embodiment 1 is illustrated. The driving sequence of Fig. 5 of Adachi et al. uses sub-frames, SF1, SF2, SF3 and SF4. As defined in column 10, lines 43-44, and shown in Figs. 3, 4 and 5, the sub-frame periods are 5H, 9H, 17H and 33H for SF1, SF2, SF3 and SF4, respectively. However, as illustrated in Figs. 3, 4 and 5 of Adachi et al., scan lines are selected such that the sub-frame periods overlap for two consecutive lines.

As an example, in Fig. 5(b) of Adachi et al., the scan line 3 uses SF4 at $t=3H$, which has a duration of 33H. However, the scan line 2 uses SF1 at $t=4H$, which has a duration of 5H. Thus, during $t=4H$ to $t=9H$, SF4 used on the scan line 3 overlaps SF1 used on the scan line 2 with respect to time. Applicant notes herein that Fig. 5(d) is a continuation of Fig. 5(b) in Adachi et al. Since this example clearly shows that the scan line selection sequence of Adachi et al. involves using sub-frame periods that overlap with respect to time for two consecutive scan lines, the cited reference of Adachi et al. does not disclose the limitation of “*varying the selection of subfield from line to line in each scanning cycle such that...the subfields of two consecutive lines do not overlap with respect to time during each scanning cycle,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Adachi et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 10 and 18, which recite limitations similar to the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the amended independent claims 10

and 18 are also not anticipated by the cited reference of Adachi et al., and requests that these amended independent claims be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2, 5-9 and 13-17

Each of the dependent claims 2, 5-9 and 13-17 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1 and 10. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Petrus Maria De Greef

Date: May 27, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300